Applicant: Eric D. Fagerburg et al.   Atty. Docket: 10559-322001/P9683
Serial No.: 09/752,100
Filed: December 28, 2000
Page: 2 of 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-28, 31 and 32 are pending, with claims
1, 11, 21, 25, 27 and 31 being independent. Reconsideration and
allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully
requested.

Missing Reference on the PTO-892 Form

Please note that the Muta reference relied on by the
current Office Action is U.S. 6,286,003, but this reference is
not listed on the PTO-892 form. An additional PTO-892 form
listing U.S. 6,286,003 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 6,
15, 16, 26 and 32 is acknowledged and appreciated. The claims
are retained, and the right to rewrite these claims in
independent form at a later date is reserved.

Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 17-25, 27, 28 and 31 stand rejected under
35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over

DoubleVision 3.0 by Tridia in view of Muta (U.S. 6,286,003).

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. 103(a) as

allegedly bing unpatentable over DoubleVision 3.0 by Tridia in

view of Muta, in further view of Edwards (US 6,594,686). These

contentions are respectfully traversed.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established

for at least two reasons. First, DoubleVision determines who

can attach to a remote terminal based entirely on the type of

user and a set of predefined permissions, which are granted in

advance using access control lists, private-users and private-

groups databases, and a ".dvsc file". (*See* DoubleVision at

section 6.6.) DoubleVision does not describe prompting a first

user for permission for a second user to control the UNIX based

machine, as recited in independent claims 1, 11, 21, 25, 27 and

31.

In response to previous remarks along these lines, the

Office now states, "it is broadly interpreted that a root user

using DoubleVision grants permission to users via an access

control list. The '.dvsc' file is a prompt for the root user to

grant permission to a select number of authorized users." (*See*

March 10, 2006 OA at ¶ 4.) However, a ".dvsc" file is not a

prompt. Rather, it is a text file that a host user can create

and edit as desired to grant permissions. (See DoubleVision at
section 6.6.1, "USING A .DVSC FILE".) Thus, DoubleVision does
not describe prompting a first user at a UNIX based machine for
permission for a second user at a machine remotely located from
the UNIX based machine to control the UNIX based machine; and if
the first user grants permission, enabling the second user to
use the UNIX based machine through the machine remotely located
from the UNIX based machine.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 should be in condition for
allowance for at least this reason. Similar reasoning also
applies to independent claims 11, 21, 25, 27 and 31, and thus
these claims should also be in condition for allowance for at
least this reason.

Second, the Office acknowledges that DoubleVision fails to
teach replicating current contents as claimed in the independent
claims, and relies on Muta for this aspect of the claimed
subject matter. However, Muta fails to cure the deficiencies of
DoubleVision.

Muta describes systems and techniques for control of a GUI
(Graphical User Interface) screen at a server in a remote
location without requiring prior installment of special remote
controlling software in a remote controlling machine. (See Muta

at Abstract.) The Office asserts that Muta's rewriting of a GUI screen on a slave server by a window system 320 operating on the slave server constitutes replicating current contents of a screen on a UNIX based machine onto a new screen running in a background of the UNIX based machine. This contention cannot be supported.

Muta clearly describes the window system 320 as operating on window messages coming from the event analyzer 315. (See Muta at col. 10, lines 42-67.) The event analyzer 315 pulls the events from the event buffer 313, and these events come from the master applet 215 at the master controller 210. (See Muta at col. 10, lines 31-41; and FIGS. 2, 3, 8, 11, and 12.) Thus, even if Muta can be considered to replicate content from one screen to another, these screens are on different machines, not the same machine. Thus, Muta cannot be considered to teach or suggest "replicating current contents of a screen on a UNIX based machine onto a new screen running in a background of the UNIX based machine", as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, independent claim 1 should be in condition for allowance for at least this additional reason. Similar reasoning also applies to independent claims 11, 21, 25, 27 and

31, and thus these claims should also be in condition for allowance for at least this additional reason.

For all of the above reasons, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 25, 27 and 31 should be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12, 13, 17-20, 22-24 and 28 are patentable based on the above arguments and the additional recitations they contain. Furthermore, independent claim 31 includes, "determining whether a user interface of a UNIX-based machine is operating in a text mode", and performing operations based on this determination. This feature of claim 31 has not yet been addressed by the Office.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

It is respectfully suggested for all of these reasons, that the current rejection is totally overcome; that none of the

Applicant: Eric D. Fagerburg et al.   Atty. Docket: 10559-322001/P9683
Serial No.: 09/752,100
Filed: December 28, 2000
Page: 7 of 7

cited art teaches or suggests the features which are claimed,

and therefore that all of these claims should be in condition

for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus

respectfully requested.

Please apply the two month extension of time fee, and any

other necessary charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2006   William E. Hunter
                                      Reg. No. 47,671

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10611952.doc